

Fairmont State University - WV

HLC ID 1663

STANDARD PATHWAY: Mid-Cycle Review

Visit Date: 10/10/2016

Dr. Maria Rose
President

Linnea Stenson
HLC Liaison

Diane Brimmer
Team Member

David Pecha
Team Member

Kristen Warmoth
Review Team Chair

Carolinda Douglass
Team Member

Kimberly Robinson
Team Member

Robert Haas
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Felix Edoho
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

10/10/2016

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Mid-Cycle Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

Fairmont State University (FSU) is a public baccalaureate institution located in West Virginia. As one of the eleven public four-year institutions in the state, FSU reports to the West Virginia Education Policy Commission (HEPC) and is guided by the statewide five-year master plan, *Leading the Way: Access. Success. Impact*. The university is governed by a twelve-member Board of Governors which includes nine lay members and three FSU members representing faculty, students and staff.

The institution's strong commitment to fostering a learner-center environment is rooted in its history. Established in 1865, FSU is West Virginia's first private normal school. From an opening enrollment of 86 to a current enrollment of almost 4,000 students, FSU has grown to be one of the state's largest public universities. Today, the university offers 51 undergraduate and five graduate degrees in formats designed to meet the needs of traditional and non-traditional learners. FSU has two additional locations in Harrison County: the Gaston Caperton Center where selected associate degrees and general education credits can be earned; and the Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center, which provides undergraduate degrees and FAA-approved flight training.

Interactions with Constituencies

President

Provost & VP for Academic Affairs

Vice President and CIO

Interim VP for Student Services

Interim VP for Administration & Fiscal Affairs/CFO

VP for University Communications

Director of Institutional Assessment & Effectiveness

Director of Planning and Grants

Associate Dean, School of Business

Associate Dean, Health and Human Performance

Dean, School of Nursing

Associate Provost & Director of Graduate Studies

Associate Dean, School of Nursing

Assistant Director of Facilities

Construction Project Manager

Financial Reporting Manager

Residential Life/Campus Judicial Officer

Director, Technology Commons

Information Systems Specialist, Tech Commons

Dean, School of Education, Health & Human Performance

Dean, School of Liberal Arts

Director, Graduate Program In Criminal Justice

Director, Honors Program

Taskstream Coordinator

Associate Dean, School of Fine Arts

Associate Dean, School of Business

Dean, School of Business

Director of Marketing

Director, Center for Educational Support Programs

President & CEO, Fairmont State Foundation, Inc.

Dean, School of Fine Arts

Director, Falcon Center and Student Activities

Director of Network, Servers, and Security

Chair, Board of Governors

Secretary, Board of Governors

Member, Board of Governors

Faculty Representative, Board of Governors

Student Representative, Board of Governors

Classified Staff Representative, Board of Governors

Director of Procurement

Manager, Payroll

Financial Reporting Managers (4)

Faculty in Open Forum and Focus Meetings (21)

Staff in Open Forum and Focus Meetings (8)

Students (2)

Additional Documents

Nursing Budget Report to the WV Board of Nursing, 2013 - 2014

Nursing Program and Student Learning Outcomes, 2015 - 2016

Education Survey Report to the WV Board of Nursing, 2015 and 2016

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

In early 2016 the newly formed Institutional Planning Leadership Council (IPLC) held a strategic planning retreat to refocus the university's mission, goals and strategies for the next two years. A product of the retreat was a revised mission statement, "The Fairmont State University family educates, enriches and engages students to achieve personal and professional success." A review of the FSU website found the university mission and vision statements listed under the "Academics" link; however, the mission statement listed on the web site was different from the statement listed above. The new mission statement has not been approved by the Board of Governors which most likely explains the discrepancy. When campus faculty and administrators were asked to articulate the mission of FSU, faculty tended to reply with the mission of their departments. Their responses were not unlike the university mission in that they emphasized student education and experience. When asked what they like most about FSU, students tended to cite the small classes and the familial feeling on campus.

In response to state budget rescissions and reductions, FSU has decided to focus its resources on strategies designed to improve recruitment and retention; enhance teaching and learning and respond to state mandated priorities. The mission statement presently under review articulates FSU's dedication to supporting students' personal and professional success. Examples of campus initiatives designed to create a learner-centered environment include the addition of dedicated academic advisors in some of the colleges and the continued development of the Title III peer mentoring program. A visit to the Frank and Jane Gabor West Virginia Folklife Center verified that the university regularly engages students in service learning projects meant to preserve West Virginian heritage. For example, several informational displays at the Folklife Center were created as a result of student research. Additionally, students are active in the cataloging and preservation of artifacts.

In fall 2015, over half of FSU's students resided in one of the five contiguous counties. About three percent were non-U.S. citizens representing 24 countries and twenty-two percent of their student body were non-traditional or older than average. Additionally, about four percent were veterans. To meet the needs of this diverse group, the university offers a broad range of traditional undergraduate and graduate degrees but also offers programs that are designed specifically to prepare learners to be competitive in the workplace. For example, the institution participates in the Regents Bachelor of Arts degree program which is designed for adult learners specifically those who have completed some coursework but did not earn a degree. FSU also offers degrees that are unique among the public institutions in West Virginia including degrees in Architectural Engineering Technology, Aviation Technology, National Security and Intelligence to name a few.

There is evidence that FSU personnel understand the institution's mission and that progress has been made toward developing a formal strategic planning process. However, at the time of this report the implementation of FSU's new strategic plan, "Reaffirming Our Future: Resetting our Strategic Compass," is delayed until the 2017-2018 academic year. Although conversations with university personnel seemed to indicate that FSU's current planning and budgeting priorities are in line with its new strategic priorities the team cannot support this observation with evidentiary statements. The visiting team is recommending that an interim monitoring report be submitted to the HLC details of which are provided below.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

Submit to the Higher Learning Commission by December 15, 2017 an interim monitoring report that includes the full implementation plan for *Reaffirming our Future: Resetting our Strategic Compass*.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

A review of Fairmont State University's website showed that their Mission and Vision statements appear under the "About" link located in a menu bar at the top of all webpages. Additionally, when visitors click on the "Academics" link they will see not only FSU's mission and vision statements but similar aspiration statements for their colleges, schools and programs. When walking around campus the team did not see the mission statement posted in public places; however, it should be noted that some buildings may have this signage as evidenced by comments made during a criterion meeting.

The Office of Assessment and Planning website seems to be the most complete source of information about FSU's Mission, Vision, Philosophy and Objectives. Although the institution recently revised its mission statement, their strategic focus on teaching and learning has remained constant and true to their roots as the first private normal school in West Virginia.

The institution's Philosophy and Objective statements give greater detail about FSU's intent as an educational provider. Some of the areas articulated in this document include the goal of preparing teachers for public institutions in West Virginia; participating actively in community projects; sharing its facilities with the public; serving as a center of information and culture; encouraging a broad spectrum of the populace to avail themselves of educational opportunities; offering curriculum to support employment opportunities and the needs of business, industrial and public service agencies in the university's service area; and offering continuing education programs to provide career enhancement, cultural enrichment and personal skill development.

A review of the faculty and staff handbooks and the 2015 - 2016 Undergraduate Catalog show that an inconsistency exists with regard to the inclusion of the Mission, Vision and Philosophy statements. The undergraduate catalog includes the mission, vision and philosophy statements; the faculty handbook includes the mission and vision statements and the staff handbook includes the mission statement. In general, though, Fairmont State University does a good job articulating publicly their mission and vision statements.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Fairmont State University is located in a region that is not particularly diverse. When you consider that the institution draws more than half of its student body from the surrounding five contiguous counties, it is clear that the university must put extra effort into building a multicultural campus. To that end, they are a member of the West Virginia Consortium on Internationalizing Higher Education and in the fall of 2015 the demographic diversity of the campus body surpassed that of the region. Comments made during conversations with FSU faculty and staff point out that the institution's athletic programs are major contributors to the university's ethnic diversity. An interesting point was also made that through financial support, e.g. scholarships and affordable tuition, the institution is able to contribute to student diversity by increasing the number of rural students who are admitted to FSU.

Diversity in the student body is also reflected in the programs and services found on campus. For example, the International Friends Program has monthly coffee hours and offers social events designed to promote a link between international students and supportive faculty, staff, students and community members. The offices of Veteran Services, Disability Services, Counseling and Career Services all offer a wide range of support for a variety of student needs.

A review of the Campus Life website reveals an impressive number of student organizations including Greek fraternities and sororities; discipline specific student groups; social awareness groups; groups promoting physical, mental and spiritual health and many others. The International Student organization promotes awareness of diversity on campus by sponsoring International Education Week and the International Festival. Additionally, FSU's curriculum reflects an awareness of the importance of preparing students to live in a multicultural society. For example, one of the outcomes of the General Studies curriculum is Cultural Awareness and Human Dignity. A few of the courses that may be taken to satisfy this outcome include Ethnology, Economic Geography, Francophone Cultures of the Americas, and Minority Literature.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Fairmont State University engages with the surrounding communities through several activities like the STEM Innovation Center, the NASA-Educator Resource Center, the Professional Development Schools Partnership and the Academy for the Arts. The institution further shows its commitment to area schools by offering robotics camps and competitions, math field days, Science After School and the Solar Energy Art and Science Workshop. In an effort to enhance cultural opportunities to the region, the university offers Town and Gown theatre productions, hosts the West Virginia Symphony Orchestra and preserves local heritage through the Gabor West Virginia Folklife Center described in 1.A. Conversations with multiple people on campus validate that FSU is the cultural and educational center for the region.

The university engages with its external constituencies through advisory boards that provide guidance when aligning academic programs with workforce and professional needs. Faculty were able to provide examples of curricular changes that were made as a result of advisory board feedback. For example, nursing faculty reported that they received feedback from their clinical and educational partners that students were not prepared adequately for leadership roles. The department responded by adding a preceptorship to the curriculum which paired students with an RN in a leadership position. The activity was very successful and at the request of students and hospital staff, the 45 hour requirement was expanded to 60 hours.

The Office of Civic Engagement and Community Service Learning assists faculty with incorporating service learning into curricula and connects the university body with community service opportunities. Examples of student service learning projects include assisting with tax return preparation, conducting economic impact studies for nonprofit projects, creating a domestic violence support group and assisting with community health needs surveys.

In the face of continued budgetary challenges, FSU has remained true to their mission of fostering a learner-centered environment. Prioritizing resources to support assessment and retention efforts, the peer mentoring program, collaborative study spaces, the Tech Commons and faculty development

opportunities are a few examples of how the institution continues to focus on its educational responsibilities.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

Fairmont State University has a long standing mission of engaging and preparing students to be successful in their personal and professional goals. Discussions with FSU students, faculty and staff revealed an understanding of the mission which has remained essentially the same since the university's inception in 1865.

Although the team did not see the mission statement communicated publicly via signage on campus, it was articulated publicly through the university website and through in-house publications.

Comments by FSU administration and faculty indicate that institutional operations were guided and continue to be guided by the old strategic plan and mission. Because FSU's new mission and strategic plan have not been fully implemented, the team was unable to say with certainty that it would also influence university operational decisions.

Two areas of focus for this Year 4 evaluation were assessment and strategic planning. Progress has been made in the area of strategic planning; however, implementation of the 2017 - 2018 strategic plan has been delayed a year while the university develops its tactical initiative areas. Because the review team was tasked with evaluating progress in the area of strategic planning and the implementation of FSU's new strategic plan has been intentionally delayed for a year, an interim monitoring report to the HLC is recommended.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU emphasizes responsibility, integrity, fairness, and ethical behavior in key university statements. It defines its core value of responsibility as "Responsibility: To fulfill obligations to ourselves, the learning community, our society, and the future. Through mutually responsible conduct, we act with integrity, we respect diversity, and we pursue an informed worldview." The Fairmont State Foundation, Inc., speaks of supporting the mission of FSU through "ethical stewardship."

The West Virginia Code Chapter 18B Article 2A helps to ensure that the Boards of Governors at West Virginia's colleges and universities show fairness and integrity. It states that Boards of Governors must involve constituency groups, clientele, and the general public in the development of West Virginia colleges' and universities' master plans. The Code also says that college and university faculty, students, and classified employees must be involved in decision making "when those groups are affected" and that a West Virginia Board of Governors must maintain a "system for hearing employee grievances and appeals."

The FSU Board of Governors' bi-monthly meetings are open to the public and to the media. A schedule of upcoming meetings is available on the website. Those who wish to speak at a meeting need only to provide a request a minimum of ten minutes before the start of the meeting.

The FSU administration demonstrated responsible conduct with an unqualified opinion from financial auditors on its 2015 financial statements. Providing an all-new student apartment building, a food court, coffee shops, and a multi-purpose conference, recreation, and student center in response to student need also shows administrator responsibility. In more than one conversation, peer reviewers heard that members of the facility staff have been commended by the State on their plans and actions to improve FSU's buildings, grounds, and infrastructure.

Good practice is shown in academic areas through statements in the Faculty Handbook on faculty expectations, faculty communication, faculty council, faculty committees, a Faculty Harassment Complaint Committee, a conflict of interest statement, academic freedom and professional responsibility, the faculty grievance procedure, and informal procedures for conflict resolution. This

statement from the faculty handbook indicates that FSU is committed to continual review and improvement: "All faculty shall receive a yearly evaluation of performance directly related to duties and responsibilities defined by the institution." Encouraging faculty development with a Professional Development Week each semester, book discussion groups, and course design workshops also show Fairmont's responsible conduct.

Evidence of integrity, ethical and responsible conduct is demonstrated with a staff handbook produced by the Office of Human Resources that includes employee and management rights and responsibilities, clearly-outlined expectations, information on accessing personnel files, progressive discipline, and a grievance procedure. The staff handbook also indicates that each staff member will have their performance appraised during the probationary period and at least once annually thereafter. Human Resources also produces the Hiring Manager's Toolkit, the search committee handbook, which shows evidence of the administration's support of consistent ethical hiring practices across the university.

FSU provides information in the academic catalog and the student handbook on grading and maintaining good academic standing. These publications also include standard processes for academic dishonesty, prejudicial or capricious academic evaluation, sexual discrimination, and social justice.

All course syllabi must contain a statement on academic integrity. The entire consolidated *Code of Student Conduct* for FSU and Pierpont Community and Technical College and a handbook summary are available online. The *Code* and summary both include procedures for reporting an incident, investigation, violations, sanctions, and appeal. The university also provides a grievance policy for graduate students.

Evidence supports the site team's observation that FSU operates with integrity; however, comments made by university employees indicate that the practice of filling open positions with in-house, interim, long-term, appointments has in some cases created the impression that administration is using this practice to promote those they favor. The team recognizes that the uncertainty of FSU's fiscal health makes interim appointments necessary, but advises that this practice may lead to insular thinking and perpetuate a perception of inequity among constituents.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The FSU recruitment brochure contains a list of the university's academic programs. FSU provides information on the requirements of its academic programs in online undergraduate and graduate academic catalogs and on college and program webpages. These items are easily accessible in both the undergraduate and the graduate academic catalogs: the names, credentials, and degree-granting institutions for faculty, tuition costs, room and board costs, and payment and refund policies. The Academic Dishonesty policy is available in the academic catalog and in the Student Handbook.

FSU states its accreditation relationships clearly on the website under "Key Accreditation" and "Organizational Affiliations" on page 6 of the 2016-2017 undergraduate catalog and page 5 of the 2016-2017 graduate catalog. FSU holds accreditation relationships with the Higher Learning Commission, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education/Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, the Technology Accreditation Commission of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, the West Virginia Board of Examiners for Registered Professional Nurses, the Commission for Education in Nursing, the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, and the Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Evidence of the FSU Board of Governors being sufficiently autonomous is shown in West Virginia Code Chapter 18B Article 2A where it is stated that each governing board has the power and duty to "determine, control, supervise and manage the financial, business and education policies and affairs of the state institution of higher education under its jurisdiction." The same Code helps the FSU Board of Governors to ensure FSU's integrity as it states that each West Virginia Board of Governors must review all academic programs and develop a master plan to include goals, priorities, degree offerings, and resource requirements.

The FSU Board of Governor's committee structure indicates that its deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution. The board committees are the Academic Affairs Committee, the Athletic Affairs Committee, the By-Laws Committee, the Enrollment Committee, Student Housing Committee, and Finance Committee. In discussion with Board members, they displayed concern for preserving and enhancing academic programs, student safety, housing, maintaining the quality of FSU graduates, and FSU as an economic driver.

To help ensure the independence and effectiveness of the Board of Governors, training is provided by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission. No more than five of the twelve members may be of a single political party, terms are staggered, and Board members may not be removed at the will of the Governor.

The employees present at open forums explained that they were aware of the meeting schedule and understood that Board meetings were open to the public. There was no indication that the Board entered into the day-to-day management of the institution.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU's commitment to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning is shown in these philosophy and objective statements shown in the original 2006-2011 Strategic Plan: Defining Our Future: "Fairmont State University considers its broad objective to be the education of its students as intelligent and productive persons, capable of participating in and understanding the world of the twenty-first century. Accordingly, the University seeks to provide a suitable environment for free and responsible inquiry into the nature, sources and implications of human knowledge and culture, and it challenges students to promote their own intellectual, social, and personal development. ...The University faculty serve this objective by guiding students in acquiring knowledge and by maintaining a dialogue with them. The University fully supports a well-educated society, and upholds the academic freedom of its faculty and students, confident that the best interests of the community are served when the search for truth is imaginative and vigorous" (Fairmont State University Website, 2016).

FSU also provides evidence of its commitment to the freedom of expression with this statement on free speech found in the 2015-2016 student handbook: "Fairmont State University highly regards First Amendment rights that guarantee freedom of speech, freedom of expression, and the right to assemble peaceably. These opportunities must be presented on an equal basis and adhere to the University's ability to remain neutral to the content of such expression and protect the rights of individuals."

The Higher Learning Commission Student Survey Results contained no complaints regarding limits on freedom of expression or restrictions on the ability to pursue truth.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU's Institutional Review Board assists with the quality and integrity of student, faculty, and staff research. In addition, faculty members serve as mentors to students in undergraduate research programs including the Undergraduate Researcher grant programs and the Summer Undergraduate Research Experience (SURE) program.

There is much evidence that FSU's policies and procedures call for responsibility while learning. Students gain skill in research and the use of library resources during Welcome Weekend, Library Palooza, and in designated freshman courses. These skills can also be learned or enhanced using online guides for writing citations, evaluating websites, and using databases. All course syllabi must contain a statement on academic dishonesty. The faculty and academic deans are largely responsible for the enforcement of academic dishonesty policy.

The FSU Board of Governors Copyright Policy offers an overview of copyright law as it pertains to coursework, library usage, and other campus projects. It also provides information on intellectual property, ownership, and obtaining copyright permissions.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

With evidence of quality work and opportunities for input, grievance, and appeal, FSU shows that its governing board, administration, faculty and staff acts with integrity and is responsible.

FSU's costs, faculty credentials, and accreditation relationships are clearly stated and readily available to students, families, and the public.

The State of West Virginia delineates the duties of the FSU Board of Governors. The Board of Governors delegates the daily management of the institution, works to advance institutional priorities, considers the interests of constituencies when making decisions, and remains independent of undue influence.

Statements from FSU demonstrate a commitment to the pursuit of truth and the freedom of expression. It is apparent from policy and procedure that FSU assists its campus community members with academic integrity, responsible research practice, and proper use of informational resources.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU offers six Associate's programs, 45 Bachelor's programs, and five Master's degrees. There are also eight pre-professional programs as well as certificate programs. Undergraduate programs are offered in six colleges/schools, while graduate programs are offered in Graduate Studies. Course and program offerings are informed by the institutional declaratory commitment to equip students for highly competitive careers in an increasingly dynamic and complex global environment. Both *Undergraduate Catalog* and *Graduate Catalog* indicate that courses and programs are current and specify appropriate levels of performance for degrees awarded.

Mechanisms for monitoring standards vis-à-vis student performance measures and currency of courses and programs are in place. They include mandatory admissions standards, policies, and procedures for all public institutions in the state, set by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC). FSU conducts systematic program review on a five-year cycle as mandated by the WVHEPC. Exceptions to this requirement are education programs that undergo national review as a substitute for the five-year review. Program review criteria incorporate "viability, adequacy, necessity, and consistency with the mission of the programs at the institution." Since 2006, approved program reviews have been published on the FSU Board of Governors website for transparency. Six undergraduate and one graduate programs appear on the website under Program Reviews for 2016 cycle.

FSU articulates and differentiates learning goals for its associate, undergraduate, and graduate programs. The last Comprehensive Evaluation team (October 29-31, 2012) stated that graduate studies did not have a "centralized" presence evidenced by the lack of graduate catalog. FSU has

established the visibility and centralized presence for its graduate studies programs. *Graduate Catalog* clearly delineates the mission and goals of Graduate Studies. There is a Director of Graduate Studies who is also an Associate Provost and reports to the Provost/VPAA. Graduate Studies Plan of Governance (Sept 8, 2015) lays out in sufficient details the governing structure that includes the Graduate Council, its composition, roles, and responsibility. All this helps to assure articulation and differentiation of learning goals for graduate studies.

Currency and quality of courses and academic programs are also maintained through accreditation by specialized agencies: Business programs by ACBSP; Education programs by NCATE/CAEP; Engineering Technology programs by ABET; and Nursing programs by ACEN and CCNE. Education programs also require mandatory approval by the state board of education, while Nursing programs also receive additional accreditation from the State Board of Nursing. Some programs are in different stages in the process of specialized accreditation (Architecture and Criminal Justice), while others, such as Chemistry, receive endorsements by professional associations. Biology, Education, Chemistry, Forensics, and Nursing students are required to take standardized exams designed by national bodies.

FSU has two off-campus locations: the Gaston Caperton Center in Clarksburg and the Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center in Bridgeport. Discussions with faculty and directors at these centers indicated that course and program requirements are the same with those on the main campus. Curriculum is consistent across the main campus and the centers, both use common syllabi and texts, and faculty at the centers are evaluated by the Directors. Business faculty and academic programs are evaluated by the School of Business Dean.

To monitor and assure sustainability of program quality and currency as well as gauge appropriate levels of student performance, FSU garners input from a variety of external constituencies. Ten individual program-specific advisory boards/committees/council (for example, Architectural Professional Advisory Committee, Computer Science/Computer Security Advisory Committee, Criminal Justice Advisory Council, and others) provide external input on a continuing basis on trends in professional disciplines and industries. The input helps FSU monitor course and program relevance and currency and ensure appropriate standards and learning goals.

FSU offers no undergraduate program entirely online. However, three graduate programs (the M.S. in Criminal Justice, the Master of Arts in Teaching, and the M. Ed.) are offered entirely online. Program faculty teach both online and in-class. Using the same textbooks and common syllabi for course with multiple sections coupled with the fact that faculty members teach online and in-class assures consistency of standards of performance, program quality, and learning goals across all locations and modes of delivery.

FSU articulates and differentiates standards and levels of student performance as well as learning outcomes for undergraduate and graduate courses and programs. While undergraduate courses and programs and learning goals are managed in their respective departmental level, learning goals for the five graduate programs are established by and centralized under Graduate Studies.

The *Graduate Studies Plan of Governance* provides for Graduate Studies Council under the purview of the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS)/Associate Provost. The plan of governance places the responsibility for the university-wide coordination and oversight of graduate policies and vetting of the graduate faculty under the DGS. The governance structure articulates and differentiates learning goals for graduate studies; fosters strategic planning and guidance to safeguard the integrity of graduate studies; and monitors graduate courses and programs to assure the requisite level of quality.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU articulates a philosophy that upholds the integrity of academic freedom of its faculty and students. Adopted in the 2013-2014 academic year, the General Studies Program fosters intellectual inquiry, acquisition, and application of knowledge. It emphasizes the importance of the liberal arts and sciences by incorporating broad learning and critical skills that are integral to educational purpose and the academic programs. The *Undergraduate Catalog* contains an extensive list of General Studies course options categorized into 16 potential outcomes with several attributes and sub-attributes. Students are required to take at least one course from each of the 16 categories. The General Studies coursework requirements also conform to Series 11, Section 6 of the WVHEPC policy.

Every undergraduate program includes at least 30 credit hours of General Studies coursework. The same General Studies requirements and student learning outcomes are included in all undergraduate degree programs. The General Studies coursework engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information as well as exchanging ideas and sharing data. The coursework also is designed to emphasize mastery of modes of inquiry or creative work as well as develop skills that are transferable and/or adaptable to ever-changing environments.

The General Studies coursework is designed to recognize and appreciate the diversity of culture in the ever-changing global environment where students live and work. The coursework equips the students to understand and address themselves to the complexity and interdependence of societies. The General Studies Program lays a solid foundation for students to absorb knowledge, develop skills and

competencies, and embrace diversity as well as life-long learning. Thus, the coursework provides knowledge base for students to grow intellectually in their fields.

The 2015 Commission-Mandated Focused Visit observed that the General Studies curriculum at FSU is “unusually diverse, requiring at least one course in each of 16 categories; and in several cases more than 20 course options for satisfying a particular category.” The interview session with 17 key individuals, most of whom were involved in designing the General Studies curriculum, confirmed an on-going effort of the General Studies Committee to streamline the 16 categories of course options and their associated attributes and sub-attributes. Revision to the General Studies curriculum and delineation of the desired attributes should enable FSU to embed them in designated courses, thereby refocusing efforts on developing mechanisms for assessing them with intentionality at the institutional level.

The philosophical thrust of the General Studies curriculum is operationalized at academic units, because they are responsible for developing opportunities for students to become engaged in scholarly research and creative endeavors. Academic units also create enabling environment for faculty to inspire students in the intellectual pursuits of gathering and interpreting data and disseminating useful knowledge in society. For example, the Behavioral Science Research Lab contains biometric, EEG, Video recording, and Eye Tracking equipment used by faculty and students in their research. Students in the School of Business are engaged in LearnLab, a technology-rich learning environment that promotes collaborative learning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

As of September 2016, FSU boasted 166 full-time faculty members, generating a faculty-student ratio of 1:17. The Faculty Qualifications table indicates that FSU has 106 adjunct faculty during the same period. These faculty are responsible for the over 4,158 students enrolled in 45 baccalaureate degree programs and five Master's degrees. The faculty confirmed a teaching load of 12 credit hours per semester. Faculty are actively engaged with students through teaching and in the governance of the institution through their participation in the 16 standing committees of the Faculty Senate, particularly the Curriculum Committee, General Studies Committee, Institutional Assessment Council, and Graduate Council. This level of engagement assures that the faculty provide effective oversight of the curricula and drive high-quality academic programs and valuable student services.

The Faculty Handbook articulates qualifications for faculty. FSU faculty are appropriately qualified and credentialed for teaching, advising, and other academic responsibility. The Handbook also defines and describes the qualifications and requirements for the five academic ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Full Professor, and Full Professor Senior Level. Faculty qualifications include a terminal degree or professional certification in the discipline. Of the 166 full-time faculty in September 2016, 111 or 66 percent boast terminal degrees. Seven of the 58 non-terminal degreed faculty are reportedly enrolled in various doctoral degree programs. Of the 147 adjunct faculty members, 34 or 23 percent hold a terminal degree; 124 or 84 percent meet the minimum academic qualifications; while 18 or 12 percent meet professional qualifications as established by the appropriate academic units in which they hold appointments. An aggregate of 141 or 96 percent of

adjunct faculty meet the minimum academic or professional qualifications to hold faculty appointment. At an open forum, concerns were expressed that given low and uncompetitive salaries and the fact that there has not been a salary increase during the past several years, FSU will find it extremely difficult if not impossible to attract and recruit new faculty, particularly for highly marketable professional programs.

To develop, enhance, and sustain high-quality academic programs and student services, faculty are strongly encouraged, and sometimes mandated by specific policy, to remain current and active in their disciplines through professional development activities. Series 9 of the WVHEPC and Faculty Handbook both mandate faculty to submit an annual faculty report comprising teaching, scholarship, and service. TaskStream is used for archival of faculty annual reports which are available for reviews by appropriate administrators. Students evaluate faculty courses and teaching every semester, utilizing the IDEA Student Ratings of Instruction system. The feedback from the IDEA surveys is provided to faculty to use for initiating changes in approach to courses or for continuous improvement of teaching. Faculty are required to address and incorporate the IDEA results of the previous year in their annual report portfolios. The results also form an integral part of the faculty evaluation for promotion and tenure. End of Semester Survey results indicated that over 70 percent of the respondents were either satisfied or strongly satisfied that faculty provided helpful instruction.

Faculty professional development opportunities to foster continuous improvement of teaching and scholarship are available. Professional Development Week, which occurs every semester, is held the week preceding the beginning of classes. Common activities include updating courses and program assessment data in the TaskStream. Previous professional development activities included workshops on Appreciative Advising and Development of Online Courses. The Title III grant from the U.S. Department of Education is a major source of funding for both faculty and staff professional development. Also, funding for faculty travel to regional, national, and international conferences to participate in professional development is available through the Provost's office, School Deans, and grant-funded projects. The Board of Governors Policy #3 details policy for faculty to take Sabbatical leave (if budget allows) to engage in research, writing, study, or other activities designed to enhance teaching and generate other benefits to the university.

Faculty in all academic units are available on a regular basis through required office hours during weekdays to advise, support, and mentor students as well as facilitate their independent intellectual engagement and scholarship. For online and hybrid courses, many faculty also employ virtual office hours for interactions with students. Student engagement in scholarship is demonstrated by the Celebration of Student Scholarship, one-day event dedicated for students to showcase the results of their independent research and scholarship. In 2015, 66 students from 13 programs participated in the event that showcased their scholarship. Each spring semester, faculty who are selected to receive awards for teaching, scholarship, advising, and other accomplishments are honored at a luncheon ceremony.

FSU has a student-oriented system in place to foster high-quality programs and student services. The system is staffed by highly qualified and appropriately credentialed professionals. Housed in Academic Affairs, the Center for Educational Support Program caters to the academic needs of undeclared majors and non-degree students. The three staff responsible for this program hold Master's degrees, and are active in various professional associations. The Writing Center, is located in the Department of Language and Literature. The Center, which is dedicated to helping to enhance the writing abilities and critical thinking skills of all FSU students irrespective of their disciplines, is staffed by a Ph.D.-level Professor from the Department of Language and Literature who supervises Peer Tutors and a Graduate Assistant. The Financial Aid office is staffed by professional Financial Aid Counselors who are knowledgeable about financial aid requirements and eligibility, and are able

to provide financial aid advising to students. Opportunities are provided for in-house training and resources are available for professional conferences.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU has a robust system of well-coordinated infrastructure and resources that support active learning and foster effective teaching. The level of student support services is adequate for and meets the needs of the student population FSU serves. Learning support, preparatory instruction, and academic advising all are in place to help and assure student success. While faculty advisors are responsible for students majoring in their programs, professional advisors are responsible for students who have not declared majors. Faculty are pleased with the quality of infrastructure at FSU. Physical infrastructure (technological, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance venues, and clinical practice sites) and other resources create conducive environments for effective instruction and active learning.

FSU has designed a system to provide guidance to students in effective use of research and information resources. Services such as New Student Orientation and freshman seminars all are well integrated and coordinated to provide a thorough grounding for students and prime them for learning and success. All students are required to take a two-course sequence in freshman English: a course in Communication and a course in Information Systems. These courses lay a foundation for the effective and ethical use of information resources. FSU has revised and revived its freshman seminar to educate incoming students more broadly and consistently on research methods and accessibility and effective use of resources.

“Appreciative Advising” is designed for advisors to invest time to properly understand students, their interests, and life experiences in order to help them navigate the academic terrain. At an open forum, faculty suggested that this approach is critical to retention of students and graduation. Cognizant of the difficulty of underprepared students to transition into college-level courses, FSU has retooled some of its introductory courses to respond to and address such needs. Since 2014, entry-level English and Math have been redesigned utilizing a co-requisite model. This approach places underprepared

students directly into college-level courses.

FSU has redesigned and modernized some of its facilities to better support learning and effective teaching. Turley Center, a centrally-located facility, was renovated in 2013 to serve as a one-stop shop to facilitate student transition and success. The facility houses critical student services: Counseling and Disability, Career Development Center, Financial Aid & Scholarships (including Veteran Services, International Student Services, Housing & Residence Life, Campus Judicial Affairs, and Center for Educational Support Programs.) The Falcon Center houses the bookstore, cafeteria as well as Student Health Services with modern facilities and exercise equipment to promote optimal student healthy living and wellness. Finally, space in Jaynes Hall has been transformed into a learning mall featuring a coffee shop and Writing Center to facilitate collaborative learning.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

There are ample opportunities for students to enrich and enhance their academic experience at FSU. There are over sixty clubs and organizations recognized and supported by the Office of Student Affairs. Department of Intramurals promotes active living and optimal healthy lifestyles and personal growth. Intercollegiate Sports supports sixteen NCAA Division II sports for men and women. The Office of Civic Engagement and Community Service Learning offers service learning choices for students, fostering the spirit of volunteerism. In 2013-2014 students put in 8,531 clock hours. That level of civic engagement was 2,031 more hours than the previous year. Results of the surveys of service learning experiences from spring and fall 2015 indicated 52 percent average satisfaction rate; 28 percent above average rate; and 12 percent high satisfaction rate among participants. However, 3.4 percent indicated below average and 4.5 percent much below average.

Other evidence of opportunities that buttress FSU's fulfillment are demonstrated by the Fairmont Community Garden Project that features collaboration among the City of Fairmont, FSU students from the College of Science and Technology and School of Education funded by the Ford Motor Company; the Open Source Intelligence Exchange that links national security and law enforcement agencies and Fairmont State's Security and Intelligence program funded by Lockheed Martin; and Solar Army, which is a collaboration with community and students in the College of Science and Technology funded by Dominion Hope.

Students in the Honors Program work with faculty mentors on independent research and they have the option of living in the Honors dorm and joining the Honors/International Student residential learning community. FSU offers Leadership Certification for students who complete 10 semesters hours, including service learning. Travel and Study Abroad Programs are excellent opportunities to enrich their learning experiences and college life. While there are numerous opportunities for students to participate in various activities, discussions at the open forum session indicated that the majority of students have not taken full advantages of them. They attributed non-involvement of students to the difficulties in balancing work and school. Because most students work to meet their basic needs, becoming engaged in co-curricular and/or extracurricular activities is challenging.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

FSU offers academic programs that boast high quality. The programs meet the academic needs of the students population at all levels of learning. The programs offered are appropriate to higher education, and they are designed to articulate and differentiate learning goals for undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded. The programs are also consistent across locations and modes of delivery. The general studies program promotes intellectual inquiry as well as the acquisition, application, and integration of learning and knowledge. Student learning outcomes of the general studies requirements are clearly articulated. Students are appropriately engaged in collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information and data. General Studies program is unwieldy, but FSU plans to revisit the program. Streamlining the number of courses and their attributes will help to develop assessment system for the General Studies coursework.

The institution boasts adequate number of faculty who are active in classroom teaching, research, and extracurricular activities. Faculty are qualified with appropriate credentials in their disciplines, and they are active and current in their fields. Recruiting and hiring of faculty are carried out under clearly articulated policies. Faculty are available to students for advising, mentoring, and guidance for independent intellectual pursuits and scholarships. The available student support services are designed to meet the needs of student population. Students are advised on available course and program options. Necessary physical infrastructure and resources are available to help to foster student learning and effective teaching.

The 2015 Commission-Mandated Focused Visit had expressed concern about the number of courses in the General Studies curriculum. Discussions during the visit indicated that the FSU General Studies Committee would be revisiting the General Studies curriculum in an effort to streamline it.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

FSU follows guidelines set forth by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHPEC) for maintaining regular program reviews. The quality of the FSU program review process as well as vetting for course- and program-level development is exhibited in a number of ways. Sufficient evidence provided within the Assurance Argument and gathered through on-site meetings supports and explains how administrators and faculty engage in specialized accrediting processes for programs which require them and systematic 5-year program reviews for programs which have historically operated without assessment direction or resources.

Authority for curricular decisions resides with the faculty as noted in the Assurance Argument and

demonstrated through conversations on-site with the Critical Friends Group, a committee whose membership is presently moving from an academic body to a committee of faculty, staff, and administrators, the Institutional Assessment Council.

Course and program-level curriculum development originates at the faculty level for traditional, online, and/or dual credit offerings. Online academic programs provide access to educational opportunities to several hundred students for whom there exists restricted access. Thus, online education is considered a service to the community especially given area rural demographics further complicated by students who are employed either full or part-time, hold community obligations, and/or have families while completing program requirements.

Transfer credit for all incoming coursework is transcribed through the Registrar's office. The Registrar follows policies established by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC) for evaluating all credit it transcripts. In early 2015, FSU was approved to participate in the State Authorization Reciprocity Agreements (SARA) which allows students to transfer course credits from state to state. The Admissions and Credits Committee, a Faculty Advisory group to the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Admissions, evaluates all policies adopted by these two offices and recommends proposed changes. The Admissions and Credits Committee also reviews and acts upon individual cases regarding admission, readmission, retention, and credits of students as well as rendering judgments on petitions for grade changes submitted by faculty and the administration. The Graduate Council and Director of Graduate Studies establishes policies with respect to graduate credit.

FSU accepts transfer credit from all regionally accredited institutions. HEPC Series 23, a new state-wide bill, requires that all West Virginia public four-year institutions review any credit coming from state institutions, whether they are accredited or not, for application to a degree program.

With regard to maintaining and exercising authority over course requirements and rigor, 3.C details how the institution assesses outcomes and levels of achievement with dual credit, online and outreach locations.

FSU maintains specialized accreditations in the following areas:

- School of Nursing: Associate of Nursing (ASM), NLAC, WVBOERP; Bachelors of Nursing (BSN) CCNE
- School of Education: Teacher Education Programs, NCATE/CAEP
- School of Fine Arts: BA in Art Education, NCATE/CAEP
- School of Business: All programs: ACBSP
- College of Science and Technology: Civil Engineering Technology (AS, BSET): ETAC of ABET; Electronics Engineering Technology (AS, BSET): ETAC of ABET; Mechanical Engineering Technology (AS, BSET): ETAC of ABET; Occupational Safety (BS): ASAC of ABET

Follow through for students' successes post graduation varies across campus. However, in Spring 2016, a "First Destination Survey" was administered to seniors, which will provide baseline data for future institutional planning and financial decisions. The institution is encouraged to continue this initiative.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

In response to concerns raised in its 2015 HLC Commission-Mandated Focus Visit, FSU has made progress toward drafting an assessment plan, the Comprehensive Institutional Assessment Plan Outline, currently under review, and, further, supporting an emerging assessment culture. Programs which have long been required to practice specialized accreditations, such as Engineering (ETAC/ABET), Nursing (NLN, NLNAC, ACEN), Business (ACBSP), and Education (NCATE/CAEP), as well as programs in the Liberal and Fine Arts, for example, are coordinating efforts to establish a campus-wide system for practicing and documenting assessment activities. In fact, programs which have not historically been called upon either to practice assessment or been offered training or resources to explore assessment as a tool for faculty, course, and program development, have made substantial progress.

The formation of the Critical Friends Group (CFG), for which institutional support has included stipends to committee members, has been pivotal in raising awareness for the role and scope of assessment on the FSU campus. Initially believing that course-level assessment would provide meaningful data for program-level decision making, FSU faculty quickly moved to a program-level approach to assessment for making programmatic decisions.

FSU's developing assessments include examples of programmatic changes made as a result of assessment based decision making. Examples of programmatic change based on assessment results include course deletions and subsequent course development based upon student feedback, course outcomes, and contemporary professional standards (Nursing: replacement of Pathophysiology with Nursing Care of the Older Adult); the use of Praxis scores to adjust content delivered in chemistry and biology courses (Science Education: addition of an Oceanography course when a deficiency in information was discovered in general science education); and using Praxis I Core Exam Scores for students and correlating them with ACT and SAT scores for students as a determining factor in deciding who might require "support courses" in mathematics and writing.

FSU faculty, staff, and administration have laid the foundation for its academic assessments; however, more work needs to be done to include non-academic areas. Since the writing of FSU's 2016 Assurance Argument, there has been the creation of an Office of Assessment and Planning. Intentionally centralizing these functions will further codify both methods and processes for collecting and disaggregating data for redistribution back to the prospective areas for use in the institution's programmatic and financial decision making.

The institution requires all academic courses and programs to articulate student learning goals and assess learning outcomes. There is evidence of assessment of course-level learning outcomes that are input in TaskStream, and are available for review by all program faculty. Information garnered from 17 faculty/staff at an open forum confirmed that individual academic programs are in various stages in the process of mapping course-level learning outcomes to program-level outcomes. The early adopters that have mapped the course-level learning outcomes to program-level outcomes are accredited programs, such as Business, Education, Engineering, and Nursing.

FSU needs to step up the process of program-level as well as institution-wide assessments, to include General Studies programs and all facets of non-academic units and student services, at the main campus as well as the outreach locations (see multi-campus report for Caperton). The institution needs to develop a framework for assessing its institutional effectiveness as well as outcomes of student services and non-academic units. While evidence can definitely be adduced for a momentum in favor of academic program assessment, however, same cannot be said of an urgency for it or the understanding of the need for institution-wide assessment. This is why it is imperative that all areas of FSU, including faculty and staff be appropriately represented on the reconstituted Institutional Assessment Council. It is also necessary for the new Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness to prioritize institution-wide assessment in her portfolio of activities.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

Submit to the HLC by December 15, 2018 an interim monitoring report that includes the following for campus, online, dual credit and outreach locations:

- Clearly identified student learning outcomes for all academic programs, including General Studies programs.
- Systematic mapping of all course-level learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes.
- Protocols for assessing program effectiveness for non-academic units and student services.
- Details of how the data/information collected will be utilized for continuous improvements of academic programs, institutional effectiveness, and non-academic services.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Based on available data and performance indicators gathered from 2013 to Fall 2014 and as outlined in the narrative 2015 Institutional Compact Update to WVHPEC, FSU has revised its targets to better reflect its demographics. As part of an institutional compact with WVHPEC (2013) to establish statewide enrollment, retention, and graduation targets and subsequent data delivery to policy makers and the general public *via* its Annual Report Card, FSU has implemented various forward thinking approaches to addressing student retention issues including affiliating with Complete College America (CCA), adopting an Appreciative Advising model, and implementing a variety of in-house retention activities housed within the Office of Retention, including FalconARC, Welcome Weekend, Mid-Year Institute, and First-Year Experience. Additionally, a Writing Center has been created and co-requisite models for English and math courses were implemented in Fall 2015.

Fairmont publishes its graduation rates through its web site:

https://www.fairmontstate.edu/files/u62/FairmontStateUniv_GraduationRates.pdf and also publishes various data reports at <https://www.fairmontstate.edu/assessment-effectiveness/institutional-data-reports>. Most of the data found on this website is related to enrollment; however, data about outcomes are referenced within program documents (e.g. NCLEX exam pass rates for Nursing).

In July 2016 FSU created a new position, the Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness. This position is tasked with improving methodologies for collecting, analyzing and disseminating data. Specific examples of programmatic change based on assessment results were noted in 4B; however, as indicated in the interim monitoring report assigned to Core Component 4.B, the process needs to be formalized.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

FSU has made progress since 2013 in designing and implementing an assessment model for its specific programs and institutional priorities, and plans are in place which have focused its retention policies and practices on regional demographics and state-mandated enrollment, retention and graduation targets. Whether the placement of the Assessment function remains under the umbrella of Student Services or not, moving forward, identifying and positioning a Faculty Lead would strengthen the solid work done to date by the Critical Friends Group (CFG) and promote sustainability for future efforts to fully implement a working assessment campus-wide program.

As indicated in 4.B, FSU faculty, staff, and administration have laid the foundation for its academic assessments; however, more work needs to be done to codify both the methods and processes for collecting and disaggregating data for redistribution back to the prospective areas for use in the institution's programmatic and financial decision making. For this reason, an interim monitoring report is recommended.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Fairmont State University has experienced a decline in state appropriations from FY14 to FY15 of approximately 1.6% as confirmed by the audited financial statements for FY15. A document provided on site revealed the FY17 initial appropriation for FSU increased 1.57% from FY16, but all predictions by staff are that state appropriations will be reduced during the current fiscal year. As evidenced by the Credit Hours Produced Chart, credit hour production declined sharply from FY13 to FY15 while showing a slight increase in FY16 of 2,170 credit hours.

Grant activity has declined during the past four fiscal years resulting in nearly a \$4.2 million reduction in funding. During conversations on campus, much of this decline resulted from the sunset of a Gear Up grant. As referenced by the Strategic Plan, continued enrollment growth and retention of current students will be critical for FSU to continue to operate at its current size and capacity. Collection of tuition, fees, and room rental is necessary to meet both operational needs of the campus community as well as to make bond debt payments. Research and application for new grants is also encouraged.

The yearly audit for FSU was submitted in accordance with state guidelines. On site a copy of the A-133 was requested and provided to accompany the main audit. During the campus visit, the interim

vice president for fiscal affairs confirmed that the late filing of the FY15 financial statements occurred due to the lateness of receiving West Virginia pension numbers. All higher education institutions in West Virginia were impacted the same way by the delay. State law requires that all agency audits be submitted by October 31. The FY15 audit was not submitted until December 2015 after the pension numbers were received and merged into the university audit.

As noted by the Higher Learning Commission, all state institutions in West Virginia are currently under heightened cash monitoring meaning they are under greater scrutiny in order to participate with Federal Student Aid. In conversations with FSU, they are currently operating under a cash reimbursement for financial aid funds. Institutions under heightened cash monitoring are concerning, so attention should be noted by both administration and the Board of Governors.

FSU believes that a strong workforce is necessary to fulfill the mission of the institution. Following a voluntary severance plan offered in 2014, many faculty positions have been filled with a three-year renewable term position appointment rather than a faculty tenured track position as confirmed by discussion with various academic supervisors. Also during a campus open forum, faculty commented that although some areas on campus had seen a reduction in travel and professional development budgets, several comments were made that travel to professional conferences was still happening.

Long-term facilities analysis and planning is currently in process at FSU. A nearly completed draft document titled "Facilities Master Plan" has been assembled by university personnel in an effort to identify facility needs driven by life safety concerns, code compliance, or system upgrades. This draft should serve as a living document where financial data centered on expenses and revenue sources can be updated as needs and/or funding changes in future years. Following a meeting with facilities personnel and a walk-through of several campus buildings, the plan appears to be a valid working tool. Evidence provided listed 28 successfully completed projects during the past few years. Buildings 1 and 2 of University Terrace (new campus dormitory building) are currently open for students and Building 3 is scheduled to be completed by late 2016.

Two additional campus locations (Gaston Caperton Center and Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center) were visited during this review. Separate multi-campus review forms were completed for both of these locations. In summary, both locations have adequate physical space for student learning, support resources, and advising of students. Technology needs have been met at both locations.

Adequate technology is critical for a campus to be vibrant, impactful and competitive. FSU provided a draft grid chart highlighting campus technology upgrades to support academic learning as well as recruitment and retention of students to campus. The document outlines a time frame from January of 2016 through December of 2017. Each project ties back to a specific strategic plan reference and is supported by a budget analysis category. At the time of the team visit, the plan had only endured nine months of existence. No updates to the chart had been made at the time of the visit to show progress. Comments from students and employees reflected positive feedback on the accessibility of wi-fi and computer labs.

As a public institution of higher education in the state of West Virginia, the university submits its budget as part of a system request to the state legislature. As evident by established policies and procedures, systems are in place to approve and monitor expenses in a timely fashion. On-site conversations with the accounting staff as well as several budget administrators confirmed that budgeting and monitoring procedures are in place and are being utilized on a regular and timely basis.

As referenced earlier in this review, FSU's mission statement was updated in January of 2016. Both

human and fiscal resources continue to be allocated in an effort to continue meeting the goals outlined in the strategic plan as supported by the 2014 Compact and 2015 Compact Update. More time will be needed to fully implement all of the current initiatives.

FSU, through the use of a committee of faculty and staff, meet regularly to review historical budget data, predict upcoming mandatory costs, and set budget priority recommendations for the campus community. During recent years of declining revenues and enrollment, this committee has not met but the budget decisions now occur with the President's Cabinet. Following conversations on campus, this committee will become active again as predicted budget cutting decisions now will be forced to look at personnel reductions.

The Composite Financial Index (CFI) for FY15 slipped into the "In the Zone" as defined by the HLC Evaluation Table. Factors contributing to this 0.64 score include the impact from an Early Retirement Incentive Plan, increased liability from the Other Post Employment Benefit (OPEB) plan as well as additional bond indebtedness incurred to build a new residence hall on campus. In visiting with personnel on-site, at the time of the campus visit, the FY16 audit was not final and staff had not calculated the HLC ratios for FY16 to see if the CFI had increased or decreased.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The Board of Governors (BOG) plays a vital role in the overall success of the university. In review of recent board minutes, evidence exists as to the depth of involvement in matters covering academics, finance, and personnel. Following a discussion with several BOG members, a clear understanding of their role and the seriousness of their decisions is evident.

Internal constituencies participate in the day-to-day advancement of the institution. The President's Cabinet meets on a weekly basis. Associate vice presidents and directors also provide suggestions and recommendations concerning policy and procedures. Faculty Senate and the Graduate Studies Council represent faculty and the Classified Employee Council champion for their respective groups. The Student Government also provides guidance to senior leadership and the Board of Governors. A number of smaller Faculty Senate committees are available to help guide and recommend policies. Eleven student groups are listed in the evidence file as being available to provide input.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Approval was granted by the Board of Governors in 2013 to create a new position on campus to track assessment and to tie those results to budgeting and planning. The position is the Director for Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness. Evidence shows that tracking began in FY16 with 12 various student services departments being tasked with this new process. Results will be used to help guide these respective areas toward improvement, future planning, and budget analysis.

In the self-study, ten advisory boards were listed as bodies that would utilize the assessment results. In conversations with faculty and department chairs at FSU, two examples were noted where data results were discussed and action recommended by advisory boards. One was from the Nursing Advisory Committee where a void in leadership was observed so the curriculum was redesigned adding a 45-hour preceptorship. Another example was from the Criminal Justice Advisory Council. Graduates were thought to lack some basic skills in writing and verbal communications as related to law enforcement. Faculty added courses that emphasized the trial process to include interview and interrogation skills. A mock trial experience was also added to the program.

FSU has several committees that work throughout the year in an effort to anticipate changes in the local community as well as the state that will impact the campus community. As referenced by the 2016 West Virginia Economic Outlook data, the coal sector has been hit hard in the past few years with job losses. Loss of tax revenue impacts state appropriations to FSU. Both 20 and 30 years long-term plans are in place to help drive some decisions on planning and facilities. This is especially helpful for infrastructure needs and building repair evaluations. Planning for the next 2 to 3 years is critical when looking at student enrollment. Some of the new initiatives put forth appear to have been successful as the FY16 enrollment increased and the fall 2016 semester also shows a slight increase.

In 2014 a new Vice President and Chief Information Officer was hired which demonstrates a

commitment to the importance of technology on campus. FSU is also utilizing the resources of a Title III Strengthening Institutions grant to focus on retention of science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) students. FSU also utilizes a shared employee through the HEPC who is tasked with helping diversify global efforts in West Virginia. Students have the opportunity to participate in study abroad programs.

During the site visit, reviewers spent time at the Gaston Caperton Center. Enrollment during the fall 2006 semester peaked at 4,000 students. Current enrollment is approximately 600 students. During visits with senior administration, concern was shared about the drop in enrollment and the cost involved with operating the center. Administrators at FSU are keenly aware of the situation and are monitoring alternatives. The team noted the concerns of this situation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Following the last team visit by the Higher Learning Commission, assessment was noted as an area of concern. Efforts have been made to bridge this institutional weakness. Three specific instruments created outside of the academic arena include a freshman survey, end of semester survey and a complete withdrawal survey. These are all designed to help with recruitment and retention efforts at the institution. Evidence provided from the freshman survey show two fall semester's data. These results have been shared with the recruitment staff, but no evidence was provided to show that any changes have been implemented. For the end of the semester survey, statistical data and charts were provided as evidence to show the results of the survey. These summaries are shared with various staff, but again no evidence was provided to show that the findings from the survey are being implemented. The exit survey was developed sometime in 2015. Only the survey instrument was provided in the assurance argument. At the time of this visit, no evidence was provided to show that data has been collected, analyzed, or implemented.

Two positions have been noted as being new or reorganized. These include the Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness along with the Director of Planning and Grants. Both of these positions have been given an aggressive list of goals to work toward and monitor for success. These initial initiatives should help build a strong foundation for FSU to move forward and help combat some of the funding shortfall challenges that are expected to continue into the future. Due to the timing of this visit, not enough time has lapsed to collect and compile any evidence of the goals and initiatives being accomplished.

Even though no hard data is available in this area, the site team feels the tools are in place to collect and evaluate the information needed to guide decision and possible changes. No monitoring report is being recommended for this area, but the next team visit should expect to see data, analysis, and evidence of any changes to policy and procedures in these areas.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

FSU demonstrates evidence that at the present time resources are sufficient to provide academic and other support services to the campus community. As referenced by evidence documents and multiple conversations with faculty, staff and the BOG, the FY17 will be impacted by the spring 2017 enrollment numbers and state appropriations not being reduced. Reserve funds have been set aside to help cushion any such disaster, but once reserve funds have been exhausted, they are not available for future needs.

The team recognizes, as does the institution, that the CFI fell below the minimum standard per HLC guidelines. If the FY16 CFI for FSU also falls below to the "In the Zone" level, the HLC will require the institution to submit additional financial documents to the Financial Panel who will submit a recommendation to the IAC. Due to the structure already outlined by the commission, no future recommendation at this time is recommended by the team, but on-going attention needs to be given to these ratios since enrollment revenue, debt, state appropriations and reserve balances all enter into this critical calculation. All of these numbers can shift over time impacting the final calculation. Timely submission of yearly audits including the OPEB benefits provided by the State of West Virginia appears to be an on-going timing challenge. Attention to this process and the impact of heightened cash management designation given to all West Virginia state schools is also noted as an area continuing conversation.

FSU has prepared extended facility plans focusing on buildings and infrastructure. These 20 and 30 year forward-looking documents provide guidance for both planning and budgeting. Strong evidence was demonstrated during the campus visit that resources have been committed and improvements have been made over the past few years to improve the campus environment. Most recently was the addition of a student housing complex.

Recently a position was created at FSU titled the Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness. This position is critical to the mission outlined in the assurance argument and the position of this team is that ongoing efforts be developed and maintained to oversee assessment activities.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met With Concerns
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	Met With Concerns
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	Met
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	Met
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met With Concerns
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	Met With Concerns
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	Met

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date

12/15/2017

Report Focus

Submit to the Higher Learning Commission an interim monitoring report that includes the full implementation plan for *Reaffirming our Future: Resetting our Strategic Compass*.

Due Date

12/14/2018

Report Focus

Submit to the HLC an interim monitoring report that includes the following for campus, online, dual credit and outreach locations:

- Clearly identified student learning outcomes for all academic programs, including General Studies programs.
 - Systematic mapping of all course-level learning outcomes to program-level learning outcomes.
 - Protocols for assessing program effectiveness for non-academic units and student services.
 - Details of how the data/information collected will be utilized for continuous improvements of academic programs, institutional effectiveness, and non-academic services.
-

Conclusion

The two criteria requiring monitoring reports target areas that were previously cited in the 2012 Comprehensive Evaluation Visit report and the 2015 Commission-Mandated Focused Visit report. Although FSU has made progress in these areas, the team determined that there was much work to be done. The monitoring reports are opportunities for the university to showcase their progress and to receive feedback before their next comprehensive review in 2022 - 2023.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met With Concerns

Pathways Recommendation

Not Applicable to This Review



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

This worksheet is to be completed by the peer review team or a Federal Compliance reviewer in relation to the federal requirements. The team should refer to the *Federal Compliance Overview* for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation.

The worksheet becomes an appendix in the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the Assurance Review or Comprehensive Quality Review.

Institution under review: Fairmont State University

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

- Evaluation team
- Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the Evaluation Team Chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Kristen M. Warmoth

- I confirm that the Evaluation Team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the [Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours](#). Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
 - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree
 - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
 - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.
2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

FSU publishes a generic definition of a credit hour (the standard Carnegie definition) but not addressed in the definition were non-traditional length courses e.g. 8-weeks or online courses. Sample syllabi were somewhat inconsistent; some syllabi did not list the credit hours for the course or meeting times. No syllabi provided listed an out-of-class work expectation of the number of hours per week, but most syllabi did include a general link to the course catalog that contains the definition. The site team determined that there was a wide-spread understanding that 8-week courses and online courses contain the same amount of work and the same learning outcomes as their campus equivalents and are assessed by the same standards. Faculty and administrators agreed that the policy needed to be revised to include the non-traditional formats and delivery modes.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.
 - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
 - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
 - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
 - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
 - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont has an appropriate process in place for handling student complaints. The complaint process is outlined in the student handbook and the process for filing a complaint is easily accessed through Fairmont's Web site.

The number of complaints reported is minimal. Based on the complaint log provided, there are no patterns of complaints that raise concerns about Fairmont's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.

Fairmont's response in the Federal Compliance report states the log entry for student complaints includes five items: date, nature of complaint, steps taken to resolve the complaint, final decision, and any student actions. However, the aggregate log example

starting on page 382 (Appendix C) does not include a description of the resolution of the complaint or any student actions. The site team spoke to faculty and administrators about centralizing the student complaint process and documenting the actions taken. A review of the HLC Student Survey Results did not indicate significant student concerns.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
 - Review the institution’s transfer policies.
 - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs.
 - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
 - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.).
 - Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont appropriately publishes information about transfers in and out of the University. Fairmont uses the TES transfer evaluation system, and the academic catalog includes general information about transfer policies. It appears Fairmont has appropriate processes in place for evaluating transfer credits. Program web and catalog pages include information about transfer. The site team verified with the registrar that FSU does not have transfer agreements with institutions other than those included in the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission and the Community and Technical College System of West Virginia's Core Coursework Transfer Agreement.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.
 - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
 - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont has appropriate processes in place to verify student identity. The university issues a login/password to each student, and this is used by students to access all of Fairmont's restricted access systems (e-mail, course management, student account, etc.). Fairmont discloses any additional fees for distance courses in the course catalog.

Although Fairmont indicated “No” on question 11, the site team confirmed that FSU offers online courses and degrees and that this was a clerical error.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.
 - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
 - **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities.
 - **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department’s review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)
 - **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution’s fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.
 - **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.
 - **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution’s policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 1 if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)

- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.
 - **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
 - **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
 - Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
 - If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
 - If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Components 2.A and 2.B*).
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

The institution meets HLC's requirements.

- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion 5 .

Rationale:

The site team confirmed with the Interim Vice President for Fiscal Affairs that the late filing of the FY15 financial statements occurred due to the lateness of receiving West Virginia pension numbers. All higher education institutions in West Virginia were impacted by the delay. State law requires that all agency audits be submitted by October 31. The FY15 audit was not submitted until December 2015 after the pension numbers were received and merged into the university audit. Staff confirmed they had not received an update on the standing of the pending appeal. As of today, the FY16 pension data needed for the FY16 audit has not been received. All expectations are that the October 31 deadline will not be met this year.

Discussion was held with staff about the CFI calculation. For FY15, the CFI did fall "below the zone" which triggered a flag within the HLC organization. A letter was sent to the institution to confirm the calculation was correct and a written response was required by FSU. If the CFI falls "below the zone" for a second straight year, FSU will be required to submit additional financial documents to be reviewed by a Financial Panel who will then submit a recommendation to the IAC.

In reference to the expending of funds for financial aid purposes, FSU staff confirmed that FSU currently is on a reimbursement basis, meaning that the institution pays financial aid to students then asks for reimbursement from the Department of Education for funds spent. They are not requesting funds in advance of payment.

Fairmont created a new position in July 2016; the Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness will be responsible for improving data reporting. Most of the data reported are related to enrollments. Data about outcomes are referenced within program documents (e.g. NCLEX exam pass rates for Nursing), but other outcome results were not included in the documents available to the Federal Compliance Reviewer. Comments to the site team indicated that the new director position would be responsible for pulling together the pockets of data reports into a central and public location.

Following is a summary of each of the major sections of the Title IV Program Responsibilities Section:

General Program Responsibilities:

Fairmont has provided adequate documentation about the University's Title IV programs. Fairmont was recertified on March 31, 2015 and the most recent Title IV program review audit was in October 2015.

Financial Responsibility Requirements

Fairmont reports no sanctions or negative outcomes based on reviews of CFI scores or financial audits. However, no audited financial statements were provided in the Federal Compliance document. Board minutes posted on Fairmont's web site (not part of the Federal Compliance response) indicate a budget deficit of \$1.1 million for 2014 (<https://www.fairmontstate.edu/aboutfsu/sites/default/files/bog-meeting/agenda/board-book-february-13-2014.pdf>) but this does not seem to be a major concern.

Default Rates

Fairmont reported two-year cohort default rates instead of three-year default rates, but this error was quickly acknowledged by Fairmont and the three year rates were provided. The CDR's are:

2010	2 Year Official:	10.9	3 Year Official:	18.2
2011	2 Year Official:	13.6	3 Year Official:	17
2012	3 Year Official:	14.2	3 Year Official:	14.2

The three-year rate is decreasing and is in line with national rates. Fairmont discontinued offering a Perkins loan program, and added financial literacy information to its FYE and residence hall programs. Fairmont participates in private loan programs. Fairmont has added an additional financial aid counselor to coordinate default management.

Campus Crime, Athletic Participation

Fairmont appropriately tracks and publishes information about campus crime and athletic participation. The information is easily accessible through the Fairmont Web site.

Student Right to Know / Equity in Athletics

Fairmont reports it has not received any negative findings, sanctions, or investigations related to student right to know or athletics. Fairmont publishes its graduation rates through its web site: https://www.fairmontstate.edu/files/u62/FairmontStateUniv_GraduationRates.pdf and also publishes various data reports at <https://www.fairmontstate.edu/assessment-effectiveness/institutional-data-reports>

Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Status

Fairmont appropriately discloses its SAP and attendance policies to students.

Contractual Relationships

Fairmont does not have contractual relationships

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.

2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Information regarding fees, programs, policies, and related information is easily accessible through Fairmont’s web site and course catalogs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
- Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
 - Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
 - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
- The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.

- The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont appropriately provides accurate information regarding its programs, locations, and accreditation status with various accreditors. Marketing and recruiting materials are appropriate. The HLC mark of affiliation is published according to HLC guidelines at <https://www.fairmontstate.edu/aboutfsu/>

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
 - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
 - Review the institution’s explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including the loan repayment rate.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont created a new position in July 2016; the Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness will be responsible for improving data reporting. Most of the data reported are related to enrollments. Data about outcomes are referenced within program documents (e.g. NCLEX exam pass rates for Nursing), but other outcome results were not included in the documents available to the Federal Compliance Reviewer or the site team. Comments to the site team indicated that the new director position would be responsible for pulling together the pockets of data reports into a central and public location.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
 - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution's website—for instance, linked to from the institution's home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
 - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont publishes some student outcome data (graduation rates) on its website at <https://www.fairmontstate.edu/assessment-effectiveness/institutional-data-reports>

The data at are for the most part data about course enrollments, student demographics, and national surveys. The Federal Compliance Reviewer could not locate specific data about outcomes such as course pass rates, national exam pass rates, and so forth. No data were reported in Appendix V. As mentioned earlier, the site team verified that the newly created

Director of Institutional Assessment and Effectiveness position is tasked with improving the institution's data reporting and making the information public. Additionally, the team confirmed that these data existed for some programs but were not reported in an easily assessable location.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
 - Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
 - Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate

reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont listed its standing with multiple accrediting agencies and provided copies of current letters and reports. The following Fairmont programs are in good standing with their respective accrediting agencies:

Nursing, Education, Fine Arts, Business, Engineering, Criminal Justice.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment (FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team’s review of the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the assurance section of the team report.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution’s notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
 - Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Fairmont provided evidence that the Institution appropriately advertised a public opportunity to comment. The university advertised through direct e-mail to students, staff, and alumni and published notices in local media.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement

(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc.
 - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Not applicable

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

Reviewed by the Federal Compliance Panel Reviewer:

- Federal Compliance report and all appendices
- Correspondence related to USDOE concern with late filing of audited financial statements
- Course catalogs
- IPEDS site for Fairmont data
- Multiple sections of the Fairmont Web Site
- The following course syllabi (some syllabi requested were not available):
 - ACCS 1110 Online Tutorial Practicum Course no longer offered; should have been removed from catalog.
 - ACCT 3301 Intermediate Accounting I.
 - ACCT 4410 Case Studies in Accounting
 - ALLH 3372 Legal and Medical Ethics
 - ARCH 4001 Community Design Assistance Center-Management
 - AVMT 2203 Reciprocating Engine Maintenance and Return to Service
 - This is a Pierpont C&TC Course. These courses should be removed from catalog.
 - BIOL 1180 Human Anatomy and Physiology (Lecture)
 - BIOL 1181 Human Anatomy and Physiology (Lab)
 - BSBA 2200 Economics
 - CHEM 1105 Chemical Principles
 - COMP 1100 Introduction to Computing
 - COMP 3380 Cryptography in Computer Security
 - CRIM 2209 Firearms
 - EDUC 3340 Instructional Design
 - ENGL 1101 Written English
 - FINC 3307 Personal Finance
 - FOLK 4400 Directed Folklore Study
 - FOSM 2227 Food and Beverage Merchandising This is a Pierpont C&TC Course. These courses should be removed from catalog.
 - HLCA 1100 Medical Terminology This is a Pierpont C&TC Course.
 - HIST 3319 Recent American Since 1941
 - HONR 3301 Honors Study/Travel
 - MGMT 4405 Operations Management
 - MATH 1113 Applied Statistics
 - MECH 2220 Fluid Mechanics
 - MUSI 1112 Piano Ensemble
 - NURS 1101 Fundamentals of Nursing
 - PHYS 1106 Principles of Physics II
 - POLI 4410 Problems in American Government
 - PSYC 2230/SOCY 2230 Social Psychology
 - RECR 1150 Introduction to Rock Climbing
 - SCIE 1100 Human Biology
 - TECH 2203 Manufacturing I Required course in the Tech Ed program which has been discontinued. This course was last taught in 2012 and should be removed from the catalog.
 - THEA 1148 Theatre Workshop
 - ARCH 5510 Architecture Design Seminar – Small Urban Context
 - CRIM 5504 Constitutional Law

- CRIM 6656 Applied Statistics
- MSBA 5850 Project Management Capstone
- SPED 6322 Evaluation in Special Education



FORM

Multi-Campus Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the Multi-Campus Evaluation, the assigned peer reviewer completes a Multi-Campus Reviewer Form. Peer reviewers should complete a separate template for each campus reviewed as part of a Multi-Campus Evaluation. The reviewer then e-mails completed forms to the rest of the evaluation team, who then discuss and integrate the findings into the final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System.

After the visit, the team chair should ensure that HLC receives a copy of all Multi-Campus Reviewer Forms, as they cannot yet be uploaded into the Assurance System. The completed forms should be sent to finalreports@hlcommission.org. The Multi-Campus Report from the institution and the Multi-Campus Reviewer Forms become part of the institution's permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

Instructions

A Multi-Campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The Form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team's deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2-3 evidence statements that make clear the team's findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer(s). Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the Multi-Campus Evaluations in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Name of Institution: Fairmont State University (FSU)

Name and Address of Branch Campus: Gaston Caperton Center, 501 West Main Street, Clarksburg, WV

Date and Duration of Visit: October 10, 2016, 1.5 hours

Reviewer(s): Carolinda Douglass and David Pecha

1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

The Gaston Caperton Center is a 36,000 square foot facility located in Clarksburg, WV, approximately 23 miles from FSU. Course offerings include general studies courses for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science programs at FSU and all required courses for the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with an emphasis in General Business.

The Center is a three story facility which consists of 15 classrooms, including three computer labs and two science labs. Faculty offices, two student lounges, an adjunct faculty workroom, small meeting rooms, and a Teaching and Learning Commons are also on site. FSU shares the Center with Pierpont Community and Technical College.

2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting, and resource allocation at the institution.

Evidentiary Statements:

The facility is managed by the Assistant Vice President for Academic Services/Director of the Gaston Caperton Center who reports directly to President. Operational procedures and support are provided through FSU, including budget and facilities maintenance.

The Center offers courses to 353 FSU students (headcount for Fall 2016), representing a substantial decrease in enrollment from a peak of 747 FSU students in Fall 2006 (headcount). A phenomenon of students "splitting" their schedules between the main campus, the Center, and online courses has been identified as possibly playing a role in declining enrollments but, at this time, there is no ongoing systematic tracking of students at the Center to provide evidence of this phenomenon. Currently, there are emerging discussions but no clear planning related to declining enrollments. This concern and the institution's response are discussed under Criterion 5.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; handicapped access; and other (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

Evidentiary Statements:

The facility is spacious and well maintained. Classrooms are comfortable and faculty and students have access to appropriate technology for learning. Students reported consistently good access to wi-fi at the Center. The facility has plenty of parking and a security guard helps to ensure safety in the parking lots and facility. There are vending machines for snacks in the facility and the Center staff maintain a list of nearby restaurants for students/faculty to visit. The facility is ADA compliant. The bookstore visits the Center at the beginning of each term to sell textbooks to students and again at the end of each term to buy back textbooks from students. The Center is convenient to public transit and some students use public transit to attend classes.

Although there are faculty offices for full-time faculty, some of the adjunct faculty voiced a concern that they did not have a private place to meet individually with students. Center staff indicated that such places do exist but more awareness of these places and how to access them may be helpful for adjunct faculty.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

4. Human Resources

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training, and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

Evidentiary Statements:

Academic administration of FSU courses offered at the Center fall under the auspices of the Dean of the respective academic unit. The Assistant Vice President for Academic Services/Director of the Gaston Caperton Center hires adjunct faculty in consultation with the relevant Dean and/or Department Chair at FSU. Some full-time faculty at the main campus also have teaching assignments at the Center.

Orientation of new adjunct faculty is primarily conducted by the Center Director. There are also online orientation materials available for new faculty. Information on additional training and faculty development opportunities are frequently emailed to faculty from FSU. The Center may want to consider additional training in relation to the distinction between FSU and Peirpont courses. Adjunct faculty reported that they are not always clear on which institution's courses and/or students they are teaching.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve, and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

Evidentiary Statements:

Students at the Caperton Center reported that they experienced convenient and consistent access to academic advising, tutorial services, and library materials via online, telephone, and in-person means. Services not available at the Center, such as disability services, are brought to campus on a regular basis by FSU personnel who schedule announced visits to work with students on a needed basis. Students also reported easy access to admissions, registration, financial aid, and job placement services. The Center Director assists students on-site with advising, registration, and financial aid concerns. There is no separate admission to the Center courses; all FSU students can register for these courses if they elect to do so.

Faculty report being well supported by the Center Director and her staff. In particular, they noted the library and technical support staff and the security staff as being outstanding. Faculty and students alike praised the Director for her dedication and attention to their needs.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

Evidentiary Statements:

Courses offered in general studies at the Center assist students in meeting individual needs but are not meant to lead directly to degree completion. Rather, they are part of a Bachelor of Art or Bachelor of Science degree program that students often complete at the main campus at FSU. Currently, data on graduation and retention of these students are not systematically collected and analyzed.

The one exception to this is the B.S. in Business Administration program that can be completed entirely at the Center. Faculty and administrators in this program report that the curriculum is consistent across the main campus and the Center, faculty at both use common syllabi and texts, and faculty at the Center are reviewed by the Center Director and the School of Business dean.

Students report that faculty and staff at the Center are available to them as needed and are attentive to their concerns. Student evaluations of courses are reviewed by the Center Director and used by FSU in faculty evaluations. Students are informed of university policies and procedures through the Student Handbook.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence, and completion sufficiently to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at a campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

Evidentiary Statements:

For the B.S. in Business Administration program, identical student learning outcomes and assessments are used both on-campus and at the Center. These data are analyzed and shared with the business faculty on a regular basis, including on Assessment Day each term.

Other faculty report that there are other standardized assessments that they have been asked to use in some of the general studies courses but it is not clear that this is consistent across courses and the faculty report that they do not see the aggregated results and analyses from these assessments. Interim monitoring for this site is being recommended under Criterion 4.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution's planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus and ensure alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

Evidentiary Statements:

The Center works to align its curricular offerings with the mission and goals of FSU as a whole by offering general studies courses and one full degree program to meet demand in the local area. However, enrollments at the Center have declined, indicating that the curricular offerings may not be meeting current local demand. Difficulties in current enrollment at the Center might be addressed through more systematic assessment of student demand for other programs.

FSU maintains oversight of the Center through the reporting line of the Center Director to the President. This enables the Center to be incorporated into planning and budgetary processes along with other schools and colleges in Academic Affairs.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Multi-Campus Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the Multi-Campus Evaluation, the assigned peer reviewer completes a Multi-Campus Reviewer Form. Peer reviewers should complete a separate template for each campus reviewed as part of a Multi-Campus Evaluation. The reviewer then e-mails completed forms to the rest of the evaluation team, who then discuss and integrate the findings into the final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System.

After the visit, the team chair should ensure that HLC receives a copy of all Multi-Campus Reviewer Forms, as they cannot yet be uploaded into the Assurance System. The completed forms should be sent to finalreports@hlcommission.org. The Multi-Campus Report from the institution and the Multi-Campus Reviewer Forms become part of the institution's permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

Instructions

A Multi-Campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The Form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team's deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2-3 evidence statements that make clear the team's findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer(s). Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the Multi-Campus Evaluations in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Report Template

Name of Institution: Fairmont State University (FSU)

Name and Address of Branch Campus: Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center,
Bridgeport, WV

Date and Duration of Visit: October 10, 2016, 1.5 hours

Reviewer(s): Carolinda Douglass and David Pecha

1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

The Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center was established in 1993 in support of the north central West Virginia aerospace industry. The Center is housed in a 54,000 square foot facility located in the Mid-Atlantic Aerospace Complex at the North Central West Virginia Airport in Bridgeport, WV. The Center is a shared facility with Pierpont Community and Technical College. FSU controls approximately 60 percent of "Hangar B," sufficient to operate the flight program. Pierpont C&TC shares the balance of the space in Hangar B. The Hangar, constructed in 2005 is a 10,000 square foot facility with built-in classroom and office space and direct access to the tarmac and runway of the North Central West Virginia Airport.

The Center's educational programming is focused exclusively on aviation, specifically on the Bachelor of Science in Aviation Technology with options in management of aviation maintenance, management of aviation administration, and a professional flight option.

2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting, and resource allocation at the institution.

Evidentiary Statements:

Administration of the B.S. in Aviation Technology program is managed from the main campus in Fairmont, WV. The program is housed under the Department of Technology within the College of Science and Technology. The Dean of the College visits the Center on a weekly basis. FSU pays a portion of the salary for the Pierpont Community and Technical College's onsite Director to assist with day to day operations.

Courses specializing in flight training are provided at the Center. Students take the rest of their courses at the main campus at FSU. Operational procedures and support are provided through FSU, including budgeting, facility maintenance, recruitment, and planning.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; handicapped access; and other (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

Evidentiary Statements:

Programs are provided in a facility with state-of-the-art equipment preparing students for aviation careers. Hangar B includes comfortable classrooms with appropriate learning technologies, a computer lab/student lounge, and meeting rooms. Parking is plentiful and the students have access to the Center's library which includes a laser grade testing facility. Vending machines are available for snacks and there are dining options within a short driving distance of the Center.

Aircraft are made available through a third-party contract; the Heart of Virginia Aviation (HOVA) is operating on a contract that was approved by the State of West Virginia in June 2015. The contract is valid until 2025, at which time it will be eligible for up to four one-year renewals. In addition to the equipment, HOVA provides instruction for three courses, or 7.5 % of the credit hours, required for the B.S. program. In the past, HOVA has also provided students with access to a flight simulator. Currently the Center does not have a simulator but expects to have one by the end of October 2016.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

4. Human Resources

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training, and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

Evidentiary Statements:

The Center Director is appropriately credentialed and maintains extensive contact with the aviation industry. Faculty have appropriate academic credentials as well as various experiences in the aviation industry. FSU has clear guidelines and procedures for personnel evaluations. Limited professional development is available to faculty at the Center.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve, and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to

admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

Evidentiary Statements:

Students take the majority of their coursework on the main campus of FSU where they have access to admissions, advising, library materials, and other resources. Many of these resources are also available online or by telephone. Class offerings are easily accessible to students at the Center (in the case of flight instruction, this is set up on an individual basis). Job placement for students is facilitated through advisor and instructor contacts.

Students in the B.S. in Aviation Technology program have unique financial aid concerns due to the expensive nature of flight instruction. FSU may want to consider assigning a specific financial aid counselor to work with these students.

Faculty have adequate resources to provide the educational offerings. Orientation and training for new faculty are provided through a week long orientation at the FSU main campus. Full-time FSU faculty interact regularly with adjunct faculty at the Center. Both full-time faculty and adjunct faculty report being invited to participate in FSU events.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

Evidentiary Statements:

With an administrative reporting line through the Dean of the College of Science and Technology, including weekly visits to the Center, FSU ensures appropriate instructional oversight of the B.S. in Aviation Technology. FSU maintains control over the faculty, curriculum, budget, and a portion of the designated facility, Hangar B, for this program. FSU works closely with the Center Director to ensure proper functioning of day to day operations.

Materials on the B.S. in Aviation Technology program are made available to the students through the Undergraduate Catalog. The Catalog also notes the additional flight fees needed to complete the program. Information on FSU's website further describes the Center and its role in the program and outlines model schedules for students to follow for degree completion.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements on the institution's processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence, and completion sufficiently to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at a campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

Evidentiary Statements:

Program assessment and evaluation of the B.S.in Aviation Technology is conducted on a regular basis with clearly outlined processes for ensuring success of students in critical learning outcomes, Processes and protocols are in place to assess student learning at multiple points in time and to maintain a system of student "checks" and practice demonstrations to ensure student safety. Student learning outcomes assessment is also embedded within the larger assessment of learning within the College of Science and Technology.

The B.S. in Aviation Technology is an FAA-approved program preparing students to sit for FAA exams, providing FSU with an additional method of program evaluation and student learning assessment.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2-3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution's planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus and ensure alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

Evidentiary Statements:

The Center is engaged in outreach and community events that are developed to sustain and continuously improve relationships with nearby aviation companies, potential students and their families, and local communities.

The Center reports through the academic and administrative structures for FSU and, thereby, is incorporated into the regular planning and budgetary processes of the University. By offering the B.S. in Aviation Technology through the College of Science and Technology, the program is well aligned with the mission of the College and FSU.

Judgment of reviewer(s) (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.



STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: Fairmont State University WV

TYPE OF REVIEW: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW: Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation. A multi-campus visit will occur in conjunction with the comprehensive evaluation to Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center Midway Park Road, Bridgeport, WV, 26330 and Gaston Caperton Center, 501 West Main Street, Clarksburg, WV, 26301. Comprehensive evaluation includes a federal compliance panel.

Year 4 Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation will include an emphasis on assessment and strategic planning.

DATES OF REVIEW: 10/10/2016 - 10/11/2016

No Change in Statement of Affiliation Status

Nature of Organization

CONTROL: Public

RECOMMENDATION: no change

DEGREES AWARDED: Associates, Bachelors, Masters

RECOMMENDATION: no change

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS:

Accreditation at the Master's level is limited to the Master of Business Administration, Master of Education, Master of Arts in Teaching, Master of Science in Criminal Justice, and Master of Architecture.

RECOMMENDATION: no change

APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS:

Prior Commission approval required.

*Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

RECOMMENDATION: no change

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

RECOMMENDATION: no change

ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES:

Multi Campus Visits, Multi Campus Visit: 2016 - 2017

Standard Pathway, Comprehensive Evaluation: 10/10/2016

Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation. A multi-campus visit will occur in conjunction with the comprehensive evaluation to Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center Midway Park Road, Bridgeport, WV, 26330 and Gaston Caperton Center, 501 West Main Street, Clarksburg, WV, 26301. Comprehensive evaluation includes a federal compliance panel.

Year 4 Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation will include an emphasis on assessment and strategic planning.

RECOMMENDATION:

Two monitoring reports:

Interim report due 12/15/17. Report to address 1A, to include the full implementation plan for the institution's strategic plan.

Interim report due 12/14/18. Report to affirm clear learning outcomes for all academic programs; systematic mapping of course learning outcome to program learning outcomes; assessment protocols for non-academic units and student services; and details for utilization of data to drive improvements of academic programs, non-academic services, and overall institutional effectiveness.

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2012 - 2013

YEAR FOR NEXT REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2022 - 2023

RECOMMENDATION: no change



ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: 1663 Fairmont State University WV

TYPE OF REVIEW: Standard Pathway: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW: Year 4 Comprehensive Evaluation. A multi-campus visit will occur in conjunction with the comprehensive evaluation to Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center Midway Park Road, Bridgeport, WV, 26330 and Gaston Caperton Center, 501 West Main Street, Clarksburg, WV, 26301. Comprehensive evaluation includes a federal compliance panel.

Year 4 Assurance Review and Comprehensive Evaluation will include an emphasis on assessment and strategic planning.

No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

	<u>Program Distribution</u>
Programs leading to Undergraduate	
Associates	7
Bachelors	50
 Programs leading to Graduate	
Doctors	0
Masters	5
Specialist	0
 Certificate programs	
Certificate	0

Recommended Change: no change

Off-Campus Activities:

In State - Present Activity

Campuses:

Robert C. Byrd National Aerospace Education Center - Bridgeport, WV

Gaston Caperton Center - Clarksburg, WV

Additional Locations: None.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Recommended Change: no change

Out Of State - Present Activity

Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change: no change

Out of USA - Present Activity

Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change: no change

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Bachelor 13.1334 School Librarian/School Library Media Specialist Teaching Specialization Internet

Bachelor 13.1308 Family and Consumer Sciences/Home Economics Teacher Education Family and Consumer Sciences Internet

Master 13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, General Special Education for Certified Teachers Internet

Master 13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, General Special education for those without teaching certification Internet

Master 13.1315 Reading Teacher Education Reading Internet

Master 13.0101 Education, General Online Learning Internet

Master 13.0101 Education, General Professional Studies Internet

Master 13.0101 Education, General Master of Arts in Teaching Internet

Master 45.04 Criminology Criminal Justice Internet

Recommended Change: no change

Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None.

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Recommended Change: no change

Contractual Relationships:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change: no change

Consortial Relationships:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change: no change



HIGHER LEARNING COMMISSION

230 South LaSalle Street, Suite 7-500
Chicago, IL 60604-1411
312.263.0456 | 800.621.7440
Fax: 312.263.7462 | hlcommission.org

January 30, 2017

Dr. Maria Rose
President
Fairmont State University
222 Hardway
1201 Locust Ave.
Fairmont, WV 26554

Dear President Rose:

This letter serves as formal notification and official record of action taken concerning Fairmont State University by the Institutional Actions Council of the Higher Learning Commission at its meeting on January 24, 2017. The date of this action constitutes the effective date of the institution's new status with HLC.

Action with Interim Monitoring. IAC accepted and modified the team report for Fairmont State University. In conjunction with this action, IAC required the following interim monitoring.

Interim Report. An Interim Report due 12/15/17 to address 1A, to include the full implementation plan for the institution's strategic plan.

Interim Report. A second Interim Report due 12/14/18 to affirm clear learning outcomes for all academic programs; systematic mapping of course learning outcome to program learning outcomes; assessment protocols for non-academic units and student services; and details for utilization of data to drive improvements of academic programs, non-academic services, and overall institutional effectiveness. In addition, concerns with 5D should be addressed in the second Interim Report as these also relate to institutional effectiveness. The institution is to demonstrate that it uses information and data to improve enrollment management.

Interim Report. An Interim Report due 3/1/18 that details the institution's plans to stabilize and increase the CFI score, while dealing with the issue of rapid decline in enrollment, with a special focus on the Gaston Caperton Center. An update on the 2016 financial audit should be included.

Further, IAC voted to change the team's evaluation of Criterion 5A and 5D from "Met" to "Met with Concerns," with the following evidence and determined that the second interim report due 12/14/18 should be modified to address 5D, and that a third Interim Report on 5A be required due 3/1/18.

5A Met with Concerns: The audit was not completed (not FSU's fault) and there was no CFI computed yet. Last year the University was in "the zone" and might still be for two years. Fairmont State is already on a cash basis for financial aid with the federal government and financial monitoring with HLC. There have been no raises for years and employee defection.

5D Met with Concerns: The University has not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it has met Core Component 5D. Surveys have been adopted to help with recruitment and retention; however, they have not been implemented or there is no evidence that data collected was used to make improvements. Furthermore, as new Directors were recently employed, it is too early to determine whether they have achieved goals set for them by the institution.

Rationale: The concern is that the University has adopted three specific surveys designed to help with recruitment and retention efforts. The adoption of these instruments was in response to concerns about assessment raised during the previous HLC visit. The University collected data from two of the surveys, but there was no evidence that these data were used to inform improvement. Furthermore, the Team was not provided with evidence that the third instrument had been used, even though it was developed “sometime in 2015.” The Team report concluded that “even though no hard data is available in this area, the site team feels the tools are in place to collect and evaluate the information needed to guide decision and possible changes. No monitoring report is being recommended for this area, but the next team visit should expect to see data, analysis, and evidence of any changes to policy and procedures in these areas.” Additionally, the only other evidence cited in 5D regards two new Director positions and the assignment of aggressive goals for these positions. However, due to the timing of the visit there is no evidence that these goals were accomplished.

There is concern with Multi-Campus (Gaston Caperton Center) conclusion, which suggests to IAC that heightened monitoring may be needed as there has been a significant decline in enrollment and there are financial concerns about the cost of operation. According to the report, no plans are in place for remediating the situation.

In two weeks, this action will be added to the *Institutional Status and Requirements (ISR) Report*, a resource for Accreditation Liaison Officers to review and manage information regarding the institution’s accreditation relationship. Accreditation Liaison Officers may request the ISR Report on HLC’s website at <http://www.hlcommission.org/isr-request>.

Information on notifying the public of this action is available at <http://www.hlcommission.org/HLC-Institutions/institutional-reporting-of-actions.html>.

If you have any questions about these documents after viewing them, please contact the institution’s staff liaison Linnea Stenson. Your cooperation in this matter is appreciated.

Sincerely,



Barbara Gellman-Danley
President

CC: ALO